

Languaging Everyday Life in Classrooms

Literacy Research: Theory,
Method, and Practice
2016, Vol. 65, 152-165
© The Author(s) 2016
Reprints and permission:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/2381336916661533
lrx.sagepub.com



David Bloome¹ and Faythe Beauchemin¹

Abstract

We explore how the languaging of everyday life in classrooms promulgates conceptions of personhood. We use the term “languaging” to argue for a shift from conceptions of language as a noun to languaging as a verb, a view of language as inseparable from and constitutive of the actions and reactions of people in response to each other. It is through languaging that people act on each other, performative and commissive acts through which people establish their and others’ personhood. All parties are involved (including students, teachers, parents, administrators, and researchers) in the languaging of daily classroom life. This languaging occurs in a dialectical process. It occurs not only in the events of daily classroom life but also in how researchers act on the classroom by languaging the classroom and in turn how this acting upon influences values, epistemologies, and the happenings of daily life in classrooms. Grounded in the microethnographic analysis of a classroom writing event, and building on the philosophy of Buber, we argue that it is through languaging that people negotiate conceptions of what it means to be human—oscillating between personhood defined as I-Thou and as I-It, with the later implying a state of alienation. We conclude with a discussion of the implications of languaging and the conceptions personhood inherent to any languaging on daily classroom life.

Keywords

languaging, classroom discourse, personhood

¹ The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA

Corresponding Author:

David Bloome, Ohio State University, 225 Ramseyer Hall, 29 W. Woodruff Ave., Columbus, OH 43210, USA.

Email: bloome.1@osu.edu

We are interested in the languaging of everyday life in classrooms and how that languaging promulgates conceptions of personhood (cf. Williams, 1977). In order to explore the relationship of languaging in classrooms and personhood, we argue for a shift in the framing of research on classroom language from viewing language as a noun (i.e., language as a system of forms, concepts, and structural relationships between sounds and meaning) to viewing language as a verb (what we call “languaging” following Becker, 1991; Stewart, 1996). As part of our interest in languaging and personhood, we are also interested in the language used by researchers in their languaging of everyday life in classrooms and the complex relationship the languaging of researchers has with languaging by teachers and students.

We begin by discussing a shift from “language” to languaging as a frame for inquiry into classrooms and cultural processes; and then, using the framing of languaging we analyze a classroom conversation from a peer instructional group. Based on that analysis, we then further theorize the relationship of languaging and personhood and then return a second time to analysis of the classroom event.

From Language to Languaging

We use the term languaging to emphasize language as a transitive verb. Whether it is teachers and students acting on each other and on the classroom (its curriculum, its structure, its materialism, etc.) or researchers acting on each other and the institutions of research and education, people language the worlds in which they live. We use the word languaging to signal a theoretical framing grounded in Becker’s (1991) theorizing of “languaging” as an alternative to structuralist views of language, what he has called a “humanistic linguistics” (Becker, 1988, p. 29). Becker (1991) writes,

[People] develop a repertoire of imperfectly remembered prior texts and acquire more and more skill at recontextualizing them in new situations . . . the a priori to languaging is not an abstract conceptual system and a means of mapping it onto sounds but particular, imperfectly remembered bits of prior text. The strategies by which memories are reshaped to present circumstances clearly vary from person to person, under general cultural and natural constraints. (And here, in these constraints, much familiar grammatical insight can be preserved, in a new frame.) Understanding another person is possible to the extent that an utterance evokes memories. A new set of metaphors for languaging emerges: communication becomes orientational and not the encoding and decoding of “meaning”. (p. 34)

Thus, languaging, as part of humanistic linguistics, emphasizes the construction of intertextuality, recontextualization, memory, the adaptation of previous uses of language and texts to new circumstances, framing and reframing, and the centrality of “orientationality”—relationships, stances, perspectives, and engagements within and to events, people, histories, the material world, the self, and so forth.

We are interested in exploring the construction of personhood in the everyday life of classrooms using the framing of languaging. We define personhood as how a culture or subculture (such as a classroom) conceptually define “person,” including what attributes are associated with person, variations in types of persons, agency, and the conception of a person regarding a degree of being an autonomous unit (an individual) versus being a member of a social group (Ahearn, 2001; Carbaugh, 1992; Egan-Robertson, 1998; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1989). Definitions of personhood include movement through time and space (Bakhtin, 1993; Geertz, 1973). A languaging perspective eschews a notion of language use as indicative of a person’s or group’s competence with language; supplanted by a conception of languaging inseparable from and constituting the actions and reactions people take in response to each other (cf. Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Stuart-Faris, 2005), which can be articulated as interactional and collaborative performance. More simply stated, it shifts attention from what individuals bring to a classroom event to what individuals collectively do as constituting classroom events.

Below, we analyze a transcript of a classroom event. We chose this event because it was one of the few events in our corpus of data in which students made explicit statements about their personhood and that showed tensions over how personhood was being languaged in the classroom (as such, it can be labeled a “telling case”; cf. Mitchell, 1984). After the analysis, we raise theoretical and philosophical questions about the languaging of classroom events, personhood, and alienation and then return to the classroom event to retheorize languaging, personhood, and alienation. This recursive movement back and forth between theorizing and analysis of a particular event (or set of events) reflects a commitment to theorizing from the field (what Geertz, 1973, has called thick description and the generation of mid-level theory; theoretical constructs that hover just above the particularities of any social event, keeping both the event and what might be made of it both situated and in reach of those particularities; see also Bloome et al., 2005).

An Interpretation of a Peer Group Discussion of Sarah’s Essay

Sarah, Em, Pat, and Kate are 12th-grade students in an Advanced Placement (AP) English language arts classroom. The students had been studying, discussing, and writing argumentative essays since the beginning of the school year in September. In 2 months, they would all take the AP test. Their teacher gave the class the task of writing an argumentative essay on a topic of their choice on a contemporary issue. After drafting their essays, the teacher provided comments, returned the essays to the students, and had them meet in small groups to get additional feedback from peers. Sarah, Em, Pat, and Kate were together in a small group, as they had often been throughout the year. Although they knew each other, they were not close friends. Before they discussed each other’s argumentative essays, they silently read them. Their interactions were video recorded and transcribed (a transcript of their conversation is in the Appendix).

Sarah goes first and tells the other three, “I have to start mine completely over” (Line 1). Her prosody and body language display frustration and embarrassment. Her essay, laying before her, has marks and comments all over it. The comments written by the teacher do not require Sarah to start completely over, but that is how she languages her relationship to the task, the teacher, the class, and her academic life in the classroom. It is in part a recognition of the demands of schooling and the nature of classroom education; one engages in tasks because they are assigned and one has to accomplish them to a level that one takes as demanded and evaluated by the teacher. So, in part what Sarah is doing is describing the institutional context; and in part, the tone, cadence, and body language she performs makes visible a metadiscursive stance toward the revisions.

She follows with a fragment, “I just” (Line 2) and then takes a deep breath (Line 3). The drama (register) of these lines signals to the other students in the group that a shift is coming. It is a shift in the key (cf. Hymes, 1974) of the interaction as well as the topic. “Like” continues the drama and shift in key from Line 1, and then Sarah pulls the other students into her narrative; “Do you guys ever feel like/you’re kinda trying to like/to be like everyone else because you don’t want to be who you really are” (Lines 5–7). This is a bold move because Sarah is making herself vulnerable by revealing something unsettling about herself; she doesn’t like who she is. These utterances can be interpreted as the construction of a public request for solidarity and empathy. The way Sarah renders the content of this sequence of utterances (Line 7, “to be like everyone else because you don’t want to be who you really are”), quickly and without much of an intonation contour, is in stark contrast to the slow, hesitant, fragmented nature of her previous utterances. The contrast highlights the content: “you don’t want to be who you really are.”

Two of the students, Pat and Kate, agree (Lines 8 and 9) and in so doing validate Sarah’s request for solidarity and empathy. Additionally, Pat and Kate confirm the shift in topic from the class assignment and having to do it “completely over,” to “not wanting to be who you are” Sarah builds on Pat and Kate’s confirmation and shifts the person from the ambiguous “you” to herself: “because / I do that all the time.” This grammatical shift in person (second- to first-person singular) has the potential to create a different framing (cf. Goffman, 1974). Having told a personal narrative (“I do that all the time”) and moved the conversation from being about a school task to their own identities and the angst they have about them, there is potential for the conversation to continue being about how they are navigating the world in which they live.

However, Sarah doesn’t continue the conversation within the frame she has constructed and that Pat and Kate have validated. With hesitation (the elongation of the vowel in “A: nd”, Line 12; and the qualification and continuation moves in Line 13) and the shift back to the universal second person in “Because you know” (Line 14), Sarah returns to the framing of schooling and the demand placed on her to submit an acceptable composition (“Like trend setting and things / I just don’t know how to write / say that in a paper”; Lines 14–16). Sarah has supplanted the topic of their social

identities (not being who she really is), with how to meet the institutional demands of schooling. Em validates Sarah's reframing ("Could you say it through a story?"; Line 19).

From that point, the discussion is directed toward offering strategies to Sarah for writing her essay. They suggest that she write it as a story (e.g., Lines 19, 23, 24–30, 45, 56, 61, and 70), that she emphasize the emotional side of the story (e.g., Lines 22, 23, 36, and 37), and that she write it in a way that other students could recognize themselves in the story (e.g., Lines 28, 29, and 31–33). Sarah takes up and validates the suggestions from Em, Pat, and Kate (Lines 49 and 76).

There are some subtleties in the comments that Em, Pat, and Kate make that suggest more complex social dynamics. In suggesting that Sarah writes her essay as a story, Em narrates part of her proposed model story (Lines 25–29) by providing dialogue. Em says, "that goes . . . oh my gosh/that happened to you/well/that happens to me." Immediately following, Em and Pat mirror each others' utterances. They use a tone of voice suggesting that they are ventriloquizing the voice that Sarah should use in the paper and the voices of those who would read her essay. Pat: "Like these things happened to you"/Em: "That happens to me/Like I did that too" (Lines 31–33). Sarah expresses ambivalence toward Em's and Pat's suggestion (Line 34; "I don't know") which may be a response to the idea itself or to the strongly assertive way in which the suggestion was offered or both. But Sarah's response seems to be negated (Line 35; Pat: "I think that could be a really good") and then ignored as Pat and Em continue extending their suggestion and intertextually locating their suggestion within the framing of argumentative essays that had been discussed in class (Lines 36–42, invoking the rhetorical triangle of pathos, logos, and ethos). Sarah yields to their suggestion, validating it in Line 49 ("So I should just focus on one story right?"), and asks for clarification about how to write the story. Sarah seeks clarification regarding how she positions herself in relationship to her peers generally. Should the essay be about herself or should it be about her peers in general? (see Lines 65 and 66; Sarah: "Should they all be personal though / or should I use friends?"). Em, Kate, and Pat confirm that she should use a narrative to construct her argument while also shifting the question to one of addressing the academic evaluation criteria that has been established in the classroom. As shown in Lines 69–75, Pat states,

As long as / It is a story that hits on what your point / It has to make the point you're trying to make / It has to be specific to that point . . . / . . . And then if you are going to make it general [*undecipherable*]

This example refers to the conceptualization of argument as staking a claim and then supporting it, a topic they discussed in class.

The discussion of Sarah's paper ends with an acknowledgment that the issues the four young women have been discussing are complex and not fully transparent. Sarah thanks Em, Pat, and Kate (see Line 76), but Em has the last utterance in this conversation, "Everything is so much easier said than done." It is a cliché; however,

perhaps because it is a cliché Em has helped distance and soften the tension that has occurred in this discussion around the ardency of the suggestions made to Sarah and given Sarah space to proceed in a way that modifies or ignores those suggestions.

Langaging Classroom Events

Since the linguistic turn in the social sciences (see Clifford & Marcus, 1986; Rorty, 1992), one of the tasks of social scientists, sociolinguistics, ethnographers, and educational researchers has been to develop a language with which to talk about everyday life (including everyday life in classrooms). One of the key issues in the pursuit of authentic accounts has been construction of emic descriptions, as opposed to etic ones. The difficulties in crafting an emic account are well discussed, most notably the effect of recontextualization and translation from one setting and audience to another and from one language to another (e.g., the language of the people in the events represented to the language of a discipline or academic field; e.g., Atkinson, 1990; Emerson, 2001; Yin, 2010).

We raise another concern with emic accounts especially emic accounts of classroom life. We take it as axiomatic that the languaging of everyday life in classrooms has been influenced by and reflects the language of educational research. For example, it is not unusual to hear teachers and students talk about outcomes of an instructional unit, best practices, and how classroom processes might be related to achievement, and so forth. The language of process-product models of classroom life (cf. Dunkin and Biddle, 1974) derived from educational psychology and other educational research fields is ubiquitous in academic classrooms and schools. But it is not only the language of process-product models that has influenced the language of classroom and schools; there is also the language of economic models.

Since *A Nation at Risk* (Gardner, 1983), if not earlier, educators and students often employ the language of market economy in their own talk. Teachers and students discuss how the time they spend in school will pay off in a good job and career, the importance of having a business-like climate in the classroom, the importance of getting one's work done, and so on. In part, it is a process of interpellation (cf. Althusser, 1971). Yet, the languaging of classroom life goes beyond interpellation. Rarely noticed even in discourse analytic studies of classroom life is the nominalization of educational processes. Processes such as reading, writing, thinking, learning, instructing, assessing, and even playing, among others, become discrete nouns and as such are quantifiable. Reading becomes a collection of skills that can be accumulated, thinking becomes the ownership of a series of strategies, learning becomes the acquisition of a body of knowledge, assessing becomes a score, and so on. Once nominalized, these processes can be owned and exchanged for various rewards including access to particular opportunities and social status (cf. Fairclough, 1992). They contribute to the constitution of a manifest cultural ideology, part of which involves the constitution of personhood.

Such understandings illustrate the fact that the crafting of a language for describing everyday life is not and cannot be merely representational; it is also performative (and thus a languaging). Such languaging is implicated in the production of meaning not as a representation of people, events, and actions, per se, but as an always evolving-meaning-in-the-making flowing through and around people as they act and react to each other. As such, the languaging of everyday life in classrooms (or elsewhere) is neither neutral with regard to the relationships of people to each other nor objective in the sense of “at a distance” from the object (daily life) of its languaging. It will be intimate and intimating; it will not approach from the sidelines (cf. Bakhtin, 1935/1981) although it may disguise itself so.

Personhood and Alienation

As part of our interest in languaging in classrooms, we are concerned with the ways in which teachers and students negotiate conceptions of personhood. Constructions of personhood influence how teachers and students conceptualize their shared lives together, think about their academic and cultural work, their role within and outside the classroom, and how they negotiate issues of morality and rationality in their everyday lives. Part of this work is thinking about how to language the subtle, daily negotiations of personhood to better understand the implications for the ways that students and teachers are together with each other in the classroom. We ask how it is that cultural constructions of personhood influence human coexistence through continual moments of being together, the fundamental with-one-another quality of our lives as human beings.

Building on the philosophy of Buber (1976), we conceptualize the state of being human as defined by our engagement in dialogue with each other as we oscillate between two modes of being—I-Thou and I-It. Dialogue here does not refer to a form or genre of conversation, a particular pattern of turn-taking; but rather it refers to an evolving communicative engagement with others (or with oneself) in which there is recognition of the self in the other (empathy, mutuality, and intersubjectivity). In I-Thou relations, we see our own humanity and the humanity of others as inseparable. Our beingness is found in being present to our relation to the other as we engage with them through events. In the I-It relation, we interact with each other and ourselves as objects disconnected from each other often to perform functions and to fulfill ends and needs. We speak the I-It with only a part of our being, not fully being present to another. Through I-It relationships, we distance ourselves from our full humanity and our sense of being in the world together resulting in alienation from each other. But neither an I-It state nor an I-Thou state is inherent or given in any social situation, including the events of everyday life in classrooms. Both I-It and I-Thou are constructed as people act and react to each other.

As Buber (1976) notes, most of the time we operate in our daily lives in an I-It state. We have to get things done. Thus, the relationship between I-It and I-Thou is not so

much a binary, as an orchestration that we do together with others. More simply stated, the relationship between I-It and I-Thou is nuanced and vacillating.

In Buber's (1976) philosophy there is no "I"; people only exist in relation to others. The concept of the autonomous and integral individual is a non sequitur except to the extent the concept of the individual is promulgated by a cultural ideology. When promulgated by a cultural ideology, it constitutes as a false consciousness in dialectical relationship with what Buber calls the essential nature of being human (I-Thou / I-It). This tension between I-Thou/I-It and I as an autonomous and integral individual can be viewed as a language game (cf. Wittgenstein, 2009). Buber has had to invent a language to describe the state(s) of being human, as he sees it; in opposition to extant language that centers the I as subject. To use I (in its various forms) either as an interlocutor or as a researcher describing an interaction is to language that interaction and embed a cultural ideology associated with such languaging. Framed within Buber's philosophy, to use I, in the sense of the autonomous individual, is by definition alienating.

In our view, an essential aspect of personhood is time or perhaps more accurately stated, timescapes (cf. Schatski, 2010). There can be no separation of people from the timescapes (chronotopes) in which they are engaged. People and timescapes are more than mutually defining, they are a part of each other. Conceptions of time and space as a social, human activity afford an understanding of time and space that are driven by social and economic relationships. A socially constructed model of time diverges from normative conceptions that regard time as an objective, linear, and quantifiable phenomena. Time in an objective sense continues on regardless of human perception, understanding, and social action (Schatski, 2010). Such conceptions of time imply an ongoing succession as well as a cause and effect relationship among events. As such, the complex, nonlinear multilayered belonging-together of human existence is unacknowledged when we account for people's actions through objective time. By contrast, definitions of time as social foreground that how people move through time and space together defines time, space, and their personhood.

Central to our understanding of any particular event is the unfolding, moment-to-moment present. From this view, the event as a whole only remains in the future, as we can only know it in its "eventness" when it comes to an end. There is no way for social actors to understand with certainty what they are doing as they are doing it as each utterance or action can be taken up in an infinite number of ways. A part of being a social actor is remaining open to the unknowingness and unpredictability of the event as each moment unfolds. As such, a classroom event or lesson as it is experienced is indeterminate, lying between what is and what is not yet.

The four young women in the classroom event described earlier are moving through the time and space of their classroom, their lives defined in part by the academic year and their movement through grades and on to university and in so doing constitutes them as objects, their personhood as an "I-It". Bureaucratically, while the students may gain knowledge and skill, they don't change, at least no more so than any manufactured product changes. Yet, at another level, the students are

changing according to a biological timescale; their bodies are changing inside and out. There are also changes in their social positioning and the social groups of which they are members. There are changes in the sets of social events available to them; and all of these changes—and how they negotiate them with others—are part of how definitions of personhood are oriented either to I-It or I-Thou. These multiple, continually evolving timescapes are not only inherent to human activity but point to the complexity and messiness of understanding and interpreting social action within classroom life.

Recognizing that all parties (e.g., teachers, students, researchers) are complicit in languaging everyday events in classrooms and that such languaging has implications for imposing naturalized conceptions of personhood and time, analyzing everyday events in classrooms needs to shift from representing what happens in events to articulating the tensions within and across the laminated languaging games of teachers, students, educational researchers, and others. What we have argued here is that at both the level of teacher–student interaction and researcher–research audience interaction, languaging in classrooms involves a dialectic related to alienation and its counterpart which might be labeled mutuality, an I-Thou personhood.

Returning to the Peer Writing Group

As we noted earlier, Sarah begins the discussion of her paper by shifting the frame from that of completing a classroom task to that of exploring who she is and who she wants to become. She is not who she wants to be; she is captured by popular culture, “trend setting” (Line 15). Her utterances are suggestive of a search for a different kind of relationship with herself (an I-Thou personhood). She also seems to be seeking a different kind of relationship with her peers—one that is characterized by mutuality, seeing oneself in the other through a sense of connectedness (an I-Thou personhood). Breaking from the utilitarian, academic language of the classroom, she revealed a sense of who she is and who she is becoming. She risks vulnerability (she can be accused of being phony and a fraud) to engage in a particular kind of relationality with her peers. In Lines 16 and 17, she says, “I just don’t know how to write/say that in a paper.”

Explicitly, then, Sarah is telling her peers and the researchers observing and video recording the group, that she is not able to language how she views herself, her relationship with her friends in the group, how the dialogue might proceed, or how she might be in the future. In academic terms, we (researchers) could say that she is operating on multiple levels including a metadiscursive level as she engages her peers. But in so doing, we (researchers) have backgrounded the I-Thou relationship that Sarah is trying to build with herself and that she is offering as personhood to her friends in the group. We (researchers) have “scientificized” the event, as well as Sarah, Em, Pat, and Kate; unknowingly perhaps, languaging their I-It personhood.

Because Em, Pat, and Kate are there with her face-to-face, they must respond to Sarah. They cannot ignore Sarah (as such ignoring would be a kind of responding).

There is no framing that they are somehow individuals there in their own space, doing their own thing, distinct from each other, without an obligation to each other. They are materially socially engaged with each other, constructing an evolving intersubjectivity which is located not so much in individual minds as in the event they are constructing through their languaging. The question for the four young women at that moment, as well as for educational researchers and others interested, in understanding what is happening in that evolving event is how Sarah's peers will respond and what personhood they will construct together in that situation.

Through the use of "it" in "Could you say it through a story?" (Line 19), Em collapses Sarah's story of trying to be like everyone else into a nondescript pronoun. The story is no longer a storytelling of offering an I-Thou relationship with others, as well as with oneself. The story and the storytelling have become an entextualized object, cultural capital to be exchanged for social capital, a good evaluation on the assignment. "Could you" shifts the topic from one of seeking shared experience, to Sarah herself and whether she, as an individual has the competence to write her experiences as a story. It is no longer a question of stance or of cultural politics, it is a technocratic issue regarding the intellectual capital an individual has acquired (which is itself a cultural ideology). The attempt at I-Thou offered by Sarah has been refracted to an I-It personhood. No longer is the discussion about understanding and seeing a part of oneself in the other. Sarah takes up the responses by Em, Pat, and Kate, as together all four create a series of I-It formulations of personhood (with each other, with themselves, and with their stories).

Final Comments

We wonder if part of what is at issue in the peer writing group event is its embeddedness in schooling and the cultural ideology of schooling that conceptualizes all within it as objects. Or perhaps, what is at issue is the students' lack of a repertoire of languaging experiences that can be recontextualized to respond to Sarah's attempt to move from an I-It personhood with her writing and her peers to an I-Thou personhood, a move away from alienation. The limited repertoire of languaging experiences keeps the students distant and alienated from each other's sense of becoming as they respond to each other with the calcified language of schooling (cf. Morrison, 1994). They seem unable to tap into what Morrison (1994) calls the nuanced, complex, midwifery properties of language. Such wondering gives additional meaning to Sarah's statement that she doesn't have the language for writing about matters of being and becoming with others (Line 16). Of course, it may not be so much that the students cannot tap into the midwifery properties of languaging nor that they lack previous languaging experiences that might be recontextualized to take up Sarah's attempted move to an I-Thou personhood. Rather, that the historical and institutional contexts of that event have not conceptualized the existence of such languaging or of conceptualizing being human as something other than I-It.

We began by exploring a few minutes of one peer group in one classroom. We approached our exploration keeping an open mind about what we might learn and the (re)theorizing in which we might engage. Sarah, Em, Pat, and Kate helped us learn about the oscillation between I-Thou and I-It personhood as they occur moment-to-moment within evolving classroom literacy events. They helped us construct theoretical hypotheses about the languaging available to them at that time in that place and by extension the languaging available to other students in other events in other classrooms as well as the languaging of personhood.

Appendix

1	S	I have to start mine completely over
2		I just
3		Deep breath
4		Like
5		Do you guys ever feel like
6		you're kinda trying to like
7		To be like everyone else because you don't want to be who you really are
8	?	Yes
9	?	Yeah
10		because
11		I do that all the time
12		A: nd
13		like
14		Because you know
15		Like trend setting and things
16		I just don't know how to write
17		say that in a paper
18		Like I know what I want to say
19	E	Could you say it through a story?
20	P	I mean you could you could
21	K	You could
22	E	Like a really good hit home
23	P	Hit home story
24	E	Like a story that goes
25		oh my gosh
26		that happened to you
27		well
28		That happens to me
29		Like I do that too
30		I don't know
31	P	Like these things happened to you
32	E	That happens to me
33	E	Like I did that too

(continued)

Appendix (continued)

34	S	I don't know
35	P	I think that could be a really good
36	E	This could be one of those essays that's really emotional
37		Like it like it hits on the emotions but then you're gonna have the logic part
38		That goes through it
39		But then you are going to have the ethics that make you
40		Wanna be you
41		Like your morals and your values
42		But the logical part of is
43		That you want to be
44	K	And like telling that story
45		Cause if you undecipherable
46		So whenever they're reading the rest of it
47		They're thinking back in their brain
48		Like undecipherable
49	S	So I should just focus on one story right?
50		Cause like you know how I wrote it
51	E	Well there could be different circumstances
52		If you are talking about
53		Uhhh you wanna address
54		like
55		Like undecipherable
56		You want a story for that
57		or
58		Then if you want to
59		ummmm
60		Act like certain people
61		You could tell a story where you
62		Like try to act a certain way
63	K	I think undecipherable
64	P	You could use more than one
65	S	Should they all be personal though
66	S	Or should I use friends
67	P	You could use both
68		You could use both
69		As long as
70		It is a story that hits on what your point
71	E	It has to make the point you're trying to make
72		It has to be specific to that point
73	K	undecipherable
74		undecipherable
75	P	And then if you are going to make it general <i>undecipherable</i>
76	S	Thank you
77		Do we wanna switch papers?
78	E	Everything is so much easier said than done

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: The research reported here was funded, in part, by the Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, through Grant No. 305A100786 to The Ohio State University. The opinions expressed here are those of the authors and do not represent views of the Institute or the U.S. Department of Education. We also gratefully acknowledge support from the Center for Video Ethnography and Discourse Analysis at The Ohio State University.

References

- Ahearn, L. (2001). Language and agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30, 109–137.
- Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. London, England: Unwin.
- Atkinson, P. (1990). *The ethnographic imagination: Textual constructions of reality*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press. (Originally published on 1935)
- Bakhtin, M. (1993). *Toward a philosophy of the act* (V. Lianpov, Trans. & M. Holquist, Ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Becker, A. L. (1988). Language in particular: A lecture. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Linguistics in context* (pp. 17–35). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Becker, A. L. (1991). Language and languaging. *Language & Communication*, 11, 33–35.
- Bloome, D., Carter, S., Christian, M., Otto, S., & Shuart-Faris, N. (2005). *Discourse analysis and the study of classroom language and literacy events—A microethnographic perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Buber, M. (1976). *I and thou* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Carbaugh, D. (1992). *Cultural communication and intercultural contact*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. (Eds.). (1986). *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dunkin, M. J., & Biddle, B. J. (1974). *The study of teaching*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Egan-Robertson, A. (1998). Learning about culture, language, and power: Understanding relationships among personhood, literacy practices, and intertextuality. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 30, 449–487.
- Emerson, R. M. (2001). *Contemporary field research: Perspectives and formulations*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.

- Gardner, D. P. (1983). *A nation at risk*. Washington, DC: The National Commission on Excellence in Education, U.S. Department of Education.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *The foundations of sociolinguistics: Sociolinguistic ethnography*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (1989). Authoring lives. *Journal of Folklore Research*, 26, 123–149.
- Mitchell, J. C. (1984). Typicality and the case study. In R. Ellen (Ed.), *Ethnographic research: A guide to general conduct* (pp. 238–241). New York, NY: Academic.
- Morrison, T. (1994). *The Nobel lecture in literature*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Rorty, R. M. (Ed.). (1992). *The linguistic turn: Essays in philosophical method*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Schatski, T. (2010). *The timespace of human activity*. New York, NY: Lexington Books.
- Stewart, J. (Ed.). (1996). *Beyond the symbol model: Reflections on the representational nature of language*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Wittgenstein, L. (2009). *Philosophical investigations* (4th ed., G. Anscombe, P. Hacker, & J. Schulte, Trans.). Malden, MA: John Wiley.
- Yin, R. (2010). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Author Biographies

David Bloome is EHE distinguished professor of Teaching and Learning and director of the Center for Video Ethnography and Discourse Analysis, College of Education and Human Ecology, The Ohio State University, USA. His research and teaching focus on how people use spoken and written language for learning in classroom and non-classroom settings, and how people use language to create and maintain social relationships, to construct knowledge, and to create communities, social institutions, and shared histories and futures.

Faythe Beauchemin is a doctoral student at The Ohio State University, USA. Her current research focuses on classroom language and literacy practices examining how these social, cultural and linguistic practices are constitutive of the particular ways in which students and teachers are with one another in school.